

10/09/2009

**THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

|                                      |   |                        |
|--------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Applicant: George Gallagher          | : | Confirmation No.: 4866 |
|                                      | : |                        |
| Application No.: 10/582,426          | : | Group Art Unit: 3767   |
|                                      | : |                        |
| Filed: June 08, 2006                 | : | Examiner: Bhisma Mehta |
|                                      | : |                        |
| For: FEED MECHANISM FOR SYRINGE PUMP | : |                        |
|                                      | : |                        |

---

Mail Stop Amendment  
Commissioner for Patents  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

**RESPONSE TO FINAL OFFICE ACTION**

Dear Sir:

**Introduction**

This is in response to an official action mailed 3 April 2009 in which rejection of the application was made final. A Petition for Extension of Time, along with the requisite fee, is included, as is a Notice of Appeal together with the required fee in order to maintain pendency for the application.

Applicant traverses the rejection of claims 22 through 32, 41 and 42, made under 35 USC 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by the Dumore Company publication FR1.562.416. Applicant further traverses the rejection of claims 22 through 35, made under 35 USC 102(b) allegedly being anticipated by United States patent 4,253,342. Applicant respectfully solicits reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections.

An objection has been raised to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a). Applicant traverses this rejection and requests reconsideration of the rejections.

An objection has been raised to the specification under 37 CFR 1.75(d); applicant respectfully traverses this objection and requests reconsideration of the same.

Without prejudice to the foregoing, and in an effort to move this application forward towards allowance, applicant has cancelled claims 22 through 35, 41 and 42, and has amended claim 36 to place into independent form, including all of the limitations of the base claim and the intervening claims, to make claim 36 allowable as indicated in paragraph 10 of the official action. Additionally, claim 37 has been amended to obviate the “means-plus-function” objection to the specification as raised by the examiner, and claims 38 and 39 have been amended to depend from claim 36, rather from claim 37 which, as asserted by the examiner, had previously included “means-plus-function” language.